

## REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated October 5, 2009, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 16-22 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 17 and 20 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein; and claims 16, 18, 21 and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In Office Action, claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that claim 21 recites the limitation "calculates an appropriate correction value of the angle formed between the two glass plates" in lines 1-2, which lacks proper antecedent basis. The Applicants have amended claim 21 to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,670,603, hereafter "Shimada") in view of Pate (U.S. Patent No. 7,187,343, hereafter "Pate"). The Applicants have amended independent claim 16 to more clearly distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art. Independent claim 16 (as amended) recites the following features:

"[a] video projector for projecting video, comprising:  
a projection optical system which projects video by short-wavelength laser light sources which emit laser lights as linear polarized lights of at least three colors of red, blue and green;  
a camera device which captures external light through the projection optical system;  
a camera shake detection unit which detects the amount of camera shake of the video projector; and

a camera shake correction unit which corrects the camera shake according to the detected amount of camera shake,

wherein said projection optical system projects the three-color laser lights without losses in their light amounts using prisms performing polarization, which are arranged such that the

respective axes thereof coincide with the polarizations of the three-color laser lights, and a part of the captured external light is incident on the camera device by the prisms performing polarization, and

wherein said camera shake correction unit performs correction of the camera shake so that projecting positions of the laser lights of three colors of red, blue and green are not deviated when the video is projected, and said camera shake detection unit detects the camera shake amount from videos at four corners of an image that is shot by the camera device.” (Emphasis added).

As amended, independent claim 16 includes the features of claims 17 and 20. Accordingly, the features noted above in independent claim 16 are fully supported by the Applicants' disclosure.

The present invention (as recited in independent claim 16) is distinguishable from the cited prior art in that a camera shake correction unit performs correction of the camera shake so that projecting positions of the laser lights of three colors of red, blue and green are not deviated when the video is projected, and the camera shake detection unit detects the camera shake amount from videos at four corners of an image that is shot by the camera device.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on the combination of Shimada and Pate for disclosing or suggesting the features of independent claim 16. However, the Examiner relies primarily on Pate for disclosing or suggesting the camera shake detection unit of the present invention (now incorporated into independent claim 16). The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of Pate.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on col. 2, lines 2-3 (see also Fig. 1, element 16) of Pate for disclosing or suggesting a camera shake detection unit that detects the camera shake amount from videos at four corners of an image that is shot by the camera device.

Pate, however, more accurately discloses a calibration technique that includes: 1) projecting the image onto the display screen to generate a reflected image; 2) comparing the reflected image with the video image data to generate a difference between the reflected image

and the video image; and 3) modifying the projected video image to reduce the difference between the reflected image and the video image.

Thus, Pate fails to disclose or suggest a camera shake detection unit that includes all the features now recited in independent claim 16. That is, Pate fails to disclose or suggest at least a camera shake detection unit that detects the camera shake amount from videos at four corners of an image that is shot by the camera device.

Moreover, Shimada is not relied on by the Examiner for disclosing or suggesting a camera shake detection unit. Accordingly, no combination of Shimada and Pate would result in, or otherwise render obvious, independent claim 16 (as amended).

In the Office Action, claims 17, 20 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada in view of Pate, and further in view of Kiyoaki (Japanese Application No. 2002/328428, hereafter “Kiyoaki”); and claims 18, 19 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada in view of Pate in view of Kiyoaki, and further in view of Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,236, hereafter “Tanaka”).

Claims 17 and 20 have been canceled thereby rendering the above rejection to those claims moot. Additionally, claims 18, 19, 21 and 22 depend (directly or indirectly) from independent claim 16. As noted above, Shimada in view of Pate fails to disclose or suggest all the features now recited in independent claim 16 (as amended). Additionally, Kiyoaki and Tanaka fail to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Shimada and Pate. Accordingly, no combination of Shimada and Pate with Kiyoaki or Tanaka would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 18, 19, 21 and 22 at least by virtue of their dependencies from independent claim 16.

In light of the above, the Applicants submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action, and pass the present application to issue.

The Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any issues remaining in the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazuhisa YAMAMOTO et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/  
By: \_\_\_\_\_  
2009.12.31 11:59:42 -05'00'

Mark D. Pratt  
Registration No. 45,794  
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
December 31, 2009